

R.T. 239-53-11, dated 3rd June 1955 issued under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931.

THE MYSORE REVISION OF STATE LAWS BILL, 1954.

Joint Select Committee Report Presented.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I beg to present the Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Revision of State Laws Bill, 1954.

While placing the Report on the Table of the House, I wish to submit that one of the Hon'ble Members Sri K. Pattabhiraman was not available on the day when the report was signed but he has since appended the signature to the report.

RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF BUSINESS IN THE ASSEMBLY.

Special Committee Report Presented.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Deputy Speaker and Chairman of the Special Committee).—I beg to present the Report of the Special Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly.

MYSORE CINEMAS (REGULATION) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1955 AND MYSORE TRAFFIC CONTROL BILL, 1955.

Introduction.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, I beg to introduce the Mysore Cinemas (Regulation) (Amendment) Bill, 1955; and The Mysore Traffic Control Bill, 1955.

MYSORE UNIVERSITY BILL, 1955.

Motion to consider.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—I move :

“That the Mysore University Bill, 1955, be taken for consideration.”

I wish to present for your consideration the Mysore University Bill, 1955, a bill to provide for the re-organisation of the University of Mysore. The important features of the Bill are set forth in the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

The University of Mysore was founded in 1916. It was the first University in our country to have been founded outside the limits of British India. It was intended to meet the special needs of Mysore. *Bharata Ratna* Sir M. Visvesvaraya in his speech at the Legislative Council in 1916 spoke of the general objects and the specific aims which led to the creation of a University for Mysore. To quote from his speech—

“The general object in the broadest sense is to encourage learning, to promote higher education, to create a centre of culture, to light a torch that would dispel the gloom of ignorance from the remotest corners of the country. The specific aims in Mysore should be what I stated in support of the University idea at a public gathering of educationists in this city, over four years ago, namely, to develop the intellectual ability and executive power of our citizens and to afford the training necessary to prepare future manufacturers, merchants, businessmen, economists, lawyers, sanitarians, engineers, statesmen, etc., for the country.”

At the commencement, the University consisted of only two colleges, namely, the Maharaja's College and the Central College, which till then had been affiliated to the University of Madras. In the forty years of its existence the University has gone on expanding by leaps and bounds. At present we have 41 colleges in all with a student strength of over 20,000. Of the existing colleges, nineteen are managed directly by the University, four by Government and eighteen by private bodies.

(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.)

The Mysore University was founded by an Act of the Legislature and so far it has been a State University. The authors of the scheme had no idea of endowing the University with autonomy as we understand it to-day. The University no doubt was organised on the model of its Indian and European counterparts and equipped with a Chancellor, a University Council, a Senate, an Academic Council, Faculties and Boards of Studies. But, for all practical purposes, the colleges of the University were institutions staffed by officers deemed to be Government servants and chiefly maintained by funds provided annually by Government. Though in actual practice Government interference has been limited and the University has been exercising considerable freedom of action, a demand has been made that autonomy should be conferred on the University so as to bring it in line with other Universities in India and abroad. The charge that the University is run largely, to use the words of Dr. C. R. Reddy, as a department of Government should be met and a solution found for it. The University, it is said, may be the creation of the State, but for that reason need not be a creature of the State or even a department of Government. The University in essence is a corporation brought into existence for realising certain objects of higher education, such as the intellectual training of the young and spread of knowledge and research in new fields of intellectual endeavour. To attain these purposes the University claims autonomy but that autonomy will not of course be to the extent of setting at naught the Government on which it depends for its wherewithal. It has a right to ask freedom within wide and well-defined limits, freedom to think, to plan and to carry out the purposes for which the University has been constituted. The autonomy in its very nature cannot be absolute. To quote from the Report of the Committee for Educational Reforms in Mysore—

“In the present context the ultimate power vests with the

legislature and the University grant is a votable item. Government have a right to retain certain control over the University and this has been provided for in the chapter on Visitorial powers”.

As the Chief Minister has said, “the University must form part of the economic and educational planning that the Government undertakes”.

University autonomy covers three fields: academic freedom, financial freedom and administrative freedom. In all these aspects Government has at present a controlling hand, though in actual practice the control is little and of a regulative nature. In the Bill presented to you the governing bodies of the University, *viz.*, the Senate, the Syndicate, the Academic Council, the Board of Appointment and the Committee of Finance are all endowed with sufficient powers and scope to administer their own affairs. The Calcutta University Commission long ago stated thus:

“A system of full Government control of a teaching University, even if the University is wholly financed by Government, has very little to recommend it. No University is likely to work well unless the sense of responsibility is brought home in the first place to its teachers and in the second place to those who are immediately entrusted with its financial administration.”

Government, as trustee for the highest interests of the nation and as the central planning authority, will retain certain powers not inconsistent with the essential freedom and autonomy of the University.

University employees will cease to be Government servants and will come directly under the control and management of University authorities. Powers of appointment will vest with a Board whose decisions, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, will be final. Government will surrender its hold on all academic matters such as courses of studies and schemes of examination.

The University under the Bill is endowed with a non-lapsable lumpsum grant. University autonomy of the kind designed in the Bill, it is hoped, will make our University Departments eligible for grants from the University Grants Commission.

In keeping with the spirit of the times and with due consideration of the suggestions made by the University Education Commission and also by the Central Ministry of Education, the Bill attempts to incorporate academic and non-academic elements in a harmonious manner. The Bill seeks to achieve a balance between the two in the constitution of the various University bodies. But a balance does not mean identity or equality. The principle of election is employed to the extent that is necessary, following the recommendations of the University Education Commission. Expert University opinion to-day leans not so much towards the method of election as to the methods of nomination, rotation and choice by seniority. Party elections, it is observed, lead to political strife and the endeavour to gain ascendancy on the part of groups of sections.

The University Education Commission referring to the mode of selecting the Vice-Chancellor says—

“Open canvassing and voting for rival candidates may have been tolerable while the post was not much more than a compliment which the university could bestow, though even so it was undignified and led to the formation of factions. But as a means of securing a man of character and reputation for an arduous and highly-skilled service it is, to put it bluntly, disastrous folly. So far as we know no other country chooses the heads of universities by such methods”.

In Bombay and Bihar, to mention only two Universities, the Vice-Chancellor is nominated by the Chancellor who is the Governor of the State.

It is with a view to eliminate strife and party spirit that in the Bill election methods are sparingly used and

wherever possible they are supplemented by selection.

Perhaps the most outstanding feature is the constitution of a Social Service Board (*vide* Chapter V) through which social service is sought to be made obligatory. The Socialistic pattern of society as envisaged and formulated by the premier national organisation of the country requires such a training even from student days. The Socialistic pattern is being implemented by the Five-Year Plans. The students emerging from the University should be enabled to take a full and effective part in these Nation-building activities. It is to this end that due provisions have been made in the Bill. This aspect of University education so frequently stressed by educational experts and University authorities is being placed before the public by the Government, in particular, by Sri K. Hanumanthaiya, Chief Minister. We are remodelling the University to suit the needs of changing times. I feel sure that the idea of social service adumbrated in the Bill will receive your best consideration.

In recent years a deep awareness of the importance of higher education for national life and welfare has come to us all. There is also an uneasy sense of the inadequacy of the present arrangement for University education. What do we expect of our University? It should provide the best teaching in the entire field of knowledge so far as the most effective use of its own resources may permit; it should offer proper training and opportunities for self-development to the widest range of students irrespective of class, caste or creed; it should expand by original investigation and research the frontiers of knowledge; it should mould and shape the young people of the country not merely by the training of the intellect but by the refinement and enrichment of the spirit; it should create in the peculiar circumstances of our country an awareness of the dignity of labour and the obligation for social service. In all these respects there has been some shortcoming just as there has been a considerable measure of success in the achievement of the

(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.)
objects for which the University was founded. We must set about correcting our deficiencies and improving the apparatus and opportunity for the proper kind of University education. Our standards in teaching, in examinations, in scholarship, in research and in conduct and character have to be raised. We cannot be content with the old patterns and old methods in view of the increasing complexity of society and shifts and strains in our national life. The Bill that is before you seeks to endow the University with the autonomy necessary for attaining these purposes. So strengthened and fortified the University of Mysore, it is hoped, will fall into line with other Universities in the country that are labouring in the same field of national service and intellectual co-operation, and achieve the highest ends of University Organisation.

I commend the Bill to you for consideration and support.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore University Bill, 1955 will be taken into consideration.”

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldurg).—Will the Hon'ble Minister make available the copies of the speech that he now made for the information of the Members—printed or cyclostyled?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I shall try to supply the copies to the members as early as possible.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molalkalmuru).—Will the consideration of the Bill be taken up after the supply of the copies of the speech or it shall be proceeded with now alone?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The consideration of the Bill cannot be postponed on account of the copies of the speech not being circulated.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Then I shall commence my speech, Sir. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗತಾನೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತಾ ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದೆ. ನಾನು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ, ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಬೇಕೇ ಬೇಡವೇ

ಎಂಬುದೀಗ ನನಗೆ ಯೋಚನೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ತಂದಿದೆಯೋ ಆ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾಧನೆಗೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಸಾಧಕ ವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಲೇಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಅಖಿಲ ಭಾರತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನೇಮಿಸಿರುವ ಯೂನಿ ವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಯಾವ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವು ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿದೆಯೋ ಅಂದದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಹಾಯ ಕೊಡುವ ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದೇರಿತೆ ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆ ದೃಷ್ಟಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಲೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ನಾನಾದರೂ ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದು ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಹೊಂದುವ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಏಳಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸುವುದನ್ನು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ನೂಕು ಬದರಾವಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು. ಆದರೆ, ಆ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆಟಾನೆವು ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲದ್ದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಮನೋದೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅತಿ ವಿಷಾದದಿಂದ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಪಾಕ್ಯವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಉದಹರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಳನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ:

“7. *The Chancellor.*—The Rajpramukh of the State of Mysore shall be the Chancellor. He shall by virtue of his office preside, when he is present, at the convocations of the University. The Chancellor shall also exercise such other powers as are conferred on him by this Act or by the Statutes, Ordinances, Regulations and Rules.”

ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಇದರಂತೆ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಧಿ ಕಾರಗಳೂ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ದತ್ತವಾಗಿವೆಯೆಂದೇನೋ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವಂತಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ‘ರಾಜ ಪ್ರಮುಖ’ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಆ ನಿಯಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ ಮಾತ್ರದಿಂದಲೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಮ್ಮೆಗೇ ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಂಡಂತಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳ ಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚಾಮರಾಜಒಡೆಯರು ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ; ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖರು ಚಾನ್ಸಲರು! ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೂಲಕವೇ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲು ಒಂದೇ ಕೊಠಡಿನಿಂದ, ಒಮ್ಮತದಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೇವಲ ಒಬ್ಬ ಗುಮಾಸ್ತ ಅದನ್ನು ತಲೆಕೆಳಗು ಮಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿದೆ.

1-30 P.M.

ಅವರ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ನೋಟ ಸಾಕು. ಆ ಯೂನಿ ವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೀನಸ್ತು ಸಹ ಬೆರೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡದಹಾಗೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್‌ ಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ರಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸದಸ್ಯರ

ಸಲಹೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೆರಕೊಡದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದಲ್ಲ, ಎರಡಲ್ಲ, ಹತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ನೂರಾರು ತೋರಿಸಬಲ್ಲೆ. ಇದು ಡೆಮೋಕ್ರಸಿ ಯುಗ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೆರಕೊಡದಿರುವ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿರುವ ತಪ್ಪಾದರೂ ಏನು? ಈ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ಗೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಲೆಕೆಳಗು ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನು ಆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾದರೂ ಏನು? ಹೀಗಾಗಿ ಈವರೆಗೂ ತಾವು ಈ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ನೀವು ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಿಳಿದೇ ನಾನೀಗ ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈ ತಪ್ಪೆವರೆಗೂ ತಾವು ಈ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗದಿರುವಂಥ ಗ್ರಾಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ವರ್ಷ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ 45 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇಂಥಂಥ ಕಟ್ಟಡಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಿಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಾದರೂ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳಿಂದಲೇ ಏನೋ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವ ಪ್ಲಾನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಅಂದಾಜುಗಳ ಮೊಬಲಗು 45 ಲಕ್ಷ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು 30 ಲಕ್ಷವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ 15 ಲಕ್ಷವನ್ನು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಉಳಿಸಿಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮುಂದಿನ ಸಾಲಿಗೆ ಈ ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿದ 15 ಲಕ್ಷದ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 30 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡುಬಿಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ ಖರ್ಚಾಗದೆ ಉಳಿದಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ನಾವು ನಾನ್‌ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್‌ಬರ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವೇನೂ ಆದುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಾಗಿ 45 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಆಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಉಳಿಯಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಕಾರಣಾಂತರಗಳಿಂದ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗದೆ ಉಳಿತಾಯವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅಥವಾ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಿತವ್ಯಯ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಮೂರನೆಯ ವರ್ಷ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ 45 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಆಸ್ತಿಯ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಉಳಿತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಮೊಬಲಗಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡುವ ಏರ್ಪಾಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಹತ್ತು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಲು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಹುಡುಗರು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಗ್ಲಿಷ್ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಪಾಠ ಮಾಡಲು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್‌ಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದೇ ಕನ್ನಡ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂಟುಸಾವಿರ ಜನರಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಅವರೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಬ್ಬರೇ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ (ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).— ಈಗ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.— ಹೌದು. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಇಬ್ಬರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ವರ್ತಮಾನ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಅನಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್‌ಗಳ ವಿಚಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದು ಎಂಥ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರಿಗಾದರೂ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆ ಉರಿಯದೆ ಇರದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಅದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟೋ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ? ಈಗ ಹತ್ತಿಪ್ಪತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾದರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಸಮಾಜಕ್ಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಈಗಲೂ ಅವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟೇ ನಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಇದೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಾದರೋ ಸಾವಿರಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಇಂದು ಅದರ ಅರ್ಧದಷ್ಟು ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಹೋಗಲಿ, ಅದರ ಕಾಲ ಭಾಗದಷ್ಟಾದರೂ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದದಿಂದ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಅರ್ಥಿಕ ಮುಗ್ಗುಟ್ಟು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಇದ್ದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ದುಡ್ಡಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಇದರಿಂದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಪುರೋಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳ ನಿವಾರಣೆಯಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಬರ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಇರಬೇಕು ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆನಿ ಆನುಕೂಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಾಮಕಾವಸ್ಥೆಗಾಗಿ ಆ ಪದವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ನೀತಿ ಕೂಡ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇದೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನಂತೆಯೇ ಇಂದೂ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಇನ್ನೂ ತಪ್ಪಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆಯೇನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ನಾನು ಈ 19ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ— ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥ್ಯಸದ ಇಲಾಖಾ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ—

“4 Principals of other Colleges to be nominated by the Chancellor as follows: ...”

That is the Government to nominate which it has been doing at present. ಇಲ್ಲ 'ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ್' ಅಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ರಾಜ ಪ್ರಮುಖರು ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದು ಸೈನಿಂಗ್ ಮೆಷಿನ್ ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅವರು ಯಾರ ಪರವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪರವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮತ್ತೆ ಬೇರೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನರನ್ನು ನಾಮಕರಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ. “Two from among the Principals of the University Professional Colleges” ಅಂದರೆ ಆ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಮತ್ತು ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ನಾಯಕ್)
 ಕಾರ್ಲೇಜಿನವರು. ಅವರು ಈಗಲೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ. "Two from among the principals of the Affiliated Colleges" ಅದೂ ಇದೆ. ಹೀಗೇ ಹಿಂದೆಯೂ ಇತ್ತು. ಈಗಲೂ ಅದೇ ಇದೆ. "One person elected by the Academic Council from among its members." ಅದೂ ಇದೆ. ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಜನತೆಯಿಂದ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕವರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಯಾವಭಾಗದಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅದನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಮನಸ್ಸಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. "One person elected by the Academic Council; three persons nominated by the Chancellor; three persons elected by the Senate from among its members" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನೇನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ, what are the powers that are added on to the powers that the University Council possessed before? My friend the Hon'ble Minister for Education did not tell us. ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿರುವಂತೆ ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೇನನ್ನೂ ಸೇರಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಂಡುಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಅಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಂಥವರನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು, ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಜನರನ್ನು ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಕರೆಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾರ್ಲೇಜಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯಸ್ಥರೂ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಇಂಥವರನ್ನೇ ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೂಲಂಕಷಪಡಿಸಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ ಅದು ಕಮಿಷನರು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅನಂತರ ಯಾರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು—ಯಾರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಕಡೆಯದಾಗಿ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಿಮ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಉನ್ನತಶಾಲೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ಆರಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದು ಅದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾದ ಬಳಿಕ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಮುಂದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂದರೆ Secretary to Education Departmentಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆ "ಇಂದಾಗೆ" ಕ್ಲಾರ್ಕನಿಂದ ಒಂದು ನೋಟ್ ಹಾಕಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ನಾಲ್ಕು ತಿಂಗಳು ಕಳೆದ ನಂತರ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಆ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳ ಟೇಬಲ್‌ಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅನಂತರ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳು ಮುಗಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಟೇಬಲ್‌ಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಲಿ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಟೇಬಲ್‌ಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅವರು ತಿಳಿಸಲಿ. ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದ ರಾಗಾಯ್ತು ಒಬ್ಬ ಹೊಸ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್ ಬೇಕು, ಅದು ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಬ್‌ಜೆಕ್ಟ್ ಬಹಳ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ವರ್ಷ ಆ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಮುಗಿದಮೇಲೆ ಆ

ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ನಿರ್ದೇಶನ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಈ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನವರಿಗೆ ಕೆಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದನ್ನೇನಾದರೂ ಅವರು ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ಕೇಳೋಣವೆಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಭಾರತೀಯರ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಜನತೆಯು ತಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ಜೀವನೋಪಾಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಅಂತೂ ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನವರು ಏನೇ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಕಡೆಗಣ್ಣಿನಿಂದ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಏಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ. . . .

*Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—
 I do not know if the Hon'ble Member has seen section 26. I wish to bring that to his notice.

"The Board of Appointments.—(1) Appointments to the teaching staff of the University shall be made in accordance with rules made by the Chancellor in consultation with the Syndicate and the Mysore Public Service Commission; and for the purpose of making such appointments there shall be a Board of Appointments consisting of the following members namely :—

- "(a) The Vice-Chancellor who shall be the *ex-officio* Chairman of the Board.
- (b) The Principal, Central College, Bangalore, when an appointment to the teaching staff for science subjects is to be made, or the Principal, Maharaja's College, Mysore, when an appointment to the teaching staff for arts subjects is to be made, or the Principal of the Professional College concerned, or when there are more than one such college, the senior-most of the Principals of such colleges when an appointment to the teaching staff for professional subjects is to be made ;

- (e) Two specialists in the subjects concerned. . . ."

I fail to understand how the remark of the Hon'ble Member that it is in

the hands of the Secretariat official would be fitted with the Commission propounded here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please see the last sub-clause (4).

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sub-clause (4) :

“ The decisions of the Board and of the Chairman in respect of appointments which they are competent to make, shall, subject to the approval of the Chancellor be final and shall not be called in question in any manner.”

In all institutions, power must vest with somebody, and so long as it is done under the rules framed by the Syndicate and the Public Service Commission, I do not think anybody could alter it. Even the Chancellor will not be able to do it. We have the judicial powers to control the whole thing. Where shall we vest it? Let the Hon'ble Member mention.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are no differences on this point. The Government also agree that they do not want this power. Therefore, it will vest with somebody. With whom do you want to vest it?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—My friend after reading clause 26 did not make out anything except that the final decision vests with the Chancellor. The Chancellor means that it vests with the Rajpramukh; Rajpramukh means that it vests with the Government; Government means that it vests with the Secretary of the Education Department and ultimately with the Education Department. How he has improved the matter by reading it I have not been able to make out. If the Hon'ble Member had pointed out that particular clause and stopped at that it would have been a different thing; if he had placed a white paper, I have had no objection. It must vest with somebody. I am suggesting that it may vest with Sri Jayachamaraja Wodeyar. Then it will be a different thing. Chancellor means one controlled by the Government which again is controlled by the staff.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Let the Hon'ble Member make some constructive proposal.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The object of Government is very clear, namely, that they are not willing to have that power. If the Hon'ble House so desires, the Government are willing to have it vested in others.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I am happy the Hon'ble Minister concedes that he is not very keen to have control. Let it vest with somebody. I suggest that it may vest with the University Council finally. There is a Board of Appointments. Let it make appointments; let it go before the University Council. Let its decision be final. That is my opinion. Let that board make a selection and let the selection of that Board come before the University Council; let it finally approve of it and let that be final and not the decision of the Secretariat.

ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಸದುದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಅನುಭವದಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—You may say something about the University Council and how it is working.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—University Council recommendation ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ Lecturer ಆಗಿ ಬಂದವನು ಈಗ Assistant Professor ಆಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸುಮಾರು ಹದಿನೆಂಟು ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲವೇ? ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ದಕ್ಷರೂ, ಅನುಭವಸ್ಥರೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ತನ:ಮನಧನವನ್ನು ಅದಕ್ಕೊಸ್ಕರ ವಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಪಿಸಿದವರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಲೆಬ್ಬಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ತಿಮ್ಮಪ್ಪಗೌಡ (ಅರಕಲಗೂಡು).—Universityಯಲ್ಲಿ seniority ignore ಮಾಡಿ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾಗಿವೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ತಾವು ಸೆನಿಯಿಟಿ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಜವಾಬು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—If there is any instance where you are well aware of any injustice being done, we are ready to rectify it.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I do not wish to say it on the floor of this House. I have stated it generally. If you want, I will bring it also to your notice.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a stage where we can improve the provisions of the Bill.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is why I am making suggestions; I have not opposed it.

ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳು ಆಗಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಸ್ವಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾದ social serviceಗೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಪದವೀಧರನಾದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ ದೇಶಸೇವೆಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ವಿನಿಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಆ ವಿಧವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಬದಲಿಸಿ ಅವನ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನಿಜವಾದ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಭಾವನೆ ಅವನಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟುವಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಮುಂದೆ ನನ್ನ ದೇಶ, ನನ್ನ ಜನತೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಉಂಟಾಗುವಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಜನತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಕಷ್ಟ ಸುಖಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡದ ಹೊರತು ಬರೀಪುಸ್ತಕ ಓದೆಯಿಂದ ಸ್ವಯೋಜನವಾಗಲಾರದು. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ, ಆತ ತನ್ನ ದೇಶ ಶ್ರಮವನ್ನೂ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಪೂವಾಗಿ ಇಡಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಕಾಲ ದುಡಿಯಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಗಮನಾರ್ಹವಾದುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಅಲ್ಲಗಳೆಯುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ವರ್ಗೀಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯರಂಗವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು Universityಗೆ ತಗಲುವ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸ್ವಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾದುದು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. Universityಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇವತ್ತು selectionಅನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಮೇಲ್ನುಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ election ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. Syndicateನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಈಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷ. ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು Syndicate ಮತ್ತು University Councilನಲ್ಲಿ representation ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯಯುತವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡೋಣ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದುದು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ವಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾದುದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is only a provision to nominate three members.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—Automatic representations ಕೆಲವು ಇವೆ. Academic Councilನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಏನು ಇತ್ತೋ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಅದೇ ಈಗಲೂ ಇದೆ.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—That is to your advantage.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—You must go forward. ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಸದುದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ elected majority ಮಾಡಿ. Academic

Council, Board of Studies ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ University Professors ಇವರುಗಳು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯವಿರುವ ಮತ್ತು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಬರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು Basic system of educationಅನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ, ಮಾಧ್ಯಮಿಕ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಒಂದು ಮಟ್ಟದಿಂದ ತರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. Secondary stage ಇನ್ನೂ ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾಲ್ಕು ಅಥವಾ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಇನ್ನೂ ನಿಗದಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದಾದರೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದ ಎಲ್ಲೆಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಈಗ Intermediate Collegeಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ Travancore-Cochin ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಬಾಕಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆ ಗಿಂತಲೂ ಹೈಸ್ಕೂಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ Intermediate College ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳ classes ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳಿವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಮಾಡಿ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ classes ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೂ First Grade College ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೂ First Grade College ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಾಗ ನಮಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಈಗಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಾಗದೆ ಇರಬಹುದು; ಅದರ ಕಾರ್ಯರಂಗ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಬಹುದು. ಅಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ, ನಾನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅರಿಕೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಹಾಗೆ, Non-lapsable grant ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲೂ Closing Balance ಮೇಲೆ ಅದು depend ಆಗಕೂಡದು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳಲು ಅಪೇಕ್ಷೆ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 38 says that, subject to the provisions of clauses (a) and (c) the Government shall, every year, make a non-lapsable lumpsum grant to the University.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The grant will be non-lapsable. But clause (b) says:—

“(b) if the Government after such enquiry as it deems fit is satisfied that there is a reduction or increase in the expenditure of the University in any year, it may reduce or increase the grant, as the case may be.”

ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಇರಬಹುದು. Financial Position enquire ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ, grantನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ ಎಂದಾಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಕಷ್ಟವಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now it is a non-lapsable grant. But there may be variations in the same.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—What I say is, it will only be reduced in the present set-up.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The Legislature could at any time amend the Act. Let there be no unreasonable apprehension that it will be reduced.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದರೆ, non-lapsable grant ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಈ ಕ್ಯಾಜಿಗೂ ಅಷ್ಟು happy combination ಇಲ್ಲ. It also amounts to looking into the balance available and looking into the possibilities of State resources. Thus looking into everything, the grant may reduce itself. ಈ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ತಾಪ್ತ ಹೊರದೇಶಗಳ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ನ್ನು ಹೋಲಿಸಿ ನೋಡಿ. ಶೇಕಡ 20 ಭಾಗ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇರುವ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶ; ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಪದವೀ ಧರರು ಬಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಇರುವ ದೇಶ. ನಮ್ಮ ಆಶೋತ್ತರವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಿಂದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿ ಬರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದ್ದೇವೆ.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—To clear his apprehension, I may state that from the very birth of this University up to this date, I want to remind the Honourable Member that in no year has the expenditure of the Government on behalf of the University been less than in the previous year. We have gone on increasing. That is the history; that is the tradition. Let there be no unnatural and unfounded apprehensions in the matter.

2 P.M.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I am very sorry to say to the contrary. ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷವೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ವರ್ಷದ ಕ್ಲೋಸಿಂಗ್ ಬ್ಯಾಲನ್ಸ್ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಿದೂಗಿಸುವಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಹಿಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಣವಷ್ಟೆ ಬಂದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. Ever since the birth of this University, the Government have always taken into consideration the closing balance. ಇದೇನು ಮಹಾಕಲನ? ಹತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷ ಹದಿನೈದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಕಟ್ಟಡಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡುವುದು. ಇದರ ಅಂದಾಜನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದು ಬರುವುದು ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ. ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನು ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳು ತಡವಾಗುವುದು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ

ಅಥವಾ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳ ಕೆಲಸವೂ ಸ್ಟಾಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ನಡೆಯುವುದು. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅವರು ತಡಮಾಡಿ ಅದು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗದೆ ಹಣ ಉಳಿದು ಹೋದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸದೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೇಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ, ಅದರ ಅಂದಾಜು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಮುಂದೆ ಬೇರೆ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಾಪ್ತ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ದನ್ನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಲಿ. That has not happened. Government, after making enquiries as to how much of the non-lapsable grant has remained over, and how much has been expended, might reduce or increase. ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪಯೋಗಿಸದೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಅದು, ಉಳಿದುಹೋದಾಗ, ಎಂದರೆ, ಅಂದಾಜು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಮಂಜೂ ರಾತಿ ಬರುವಾಗ, ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದಲಾದರೂ ತಡವಾದಾಗ, ಹಣ ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಹೀಗೆ ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ, it has not made much headway. Grants ಎನ್ನುವ ಕ್ಯಾಜಿ ನಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಉಪಯೋಗವೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, Government may, after making enquiries, if it is found necessary, considering the expenditure, increase the definite grant which it gives annually. . . . ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಹೊರತು reduce ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದ ಬಂದಕೂಡಲೇ closing balance ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಇನ್ನೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೆ ಸದುತ್ಪತ್ತಿ.

ಸೆನೇಟ್, ಆಕ್ಯಾಡೆಮಿಕ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥ್ಯಾನ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಹೇಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಜನತೆಯ ಸಹಕಾರವಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾದ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಎರಡು ಸಭೆಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. . . .

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It goes against the University autonomy!

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I am asking for representation for the representatives of this House.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Let the whole House have it.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The whole House. If the House cannot administer the day-to-day affairs, let the representatives of this House be there. That is my proposal. ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಈಗ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಆಗಲಿ. ಹಿಂದಿದ್ದ ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಈಗ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಲಿ. ಈ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.)

ಇನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಪದವೀಧರರ ಪ್ರಾತಿ ನಿಧ್ಯ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಪದವೀಧರರು ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಡೆಯೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವ ಪದವೀಧರರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಂಡು ಈಗಿನ ಎರ ದರಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿದರೆ ನಿಜ ವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಅವ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆದು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸೇವೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥನ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ದೈಹಿಕ ಶ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯನೂ ವೃತ್ತಿ ಯನ್ನು ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಕಾರಿಯಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಪಠ್ಯ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ವಿಜ್ಞಾನ ವಿಷ ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪದಾರ್ಥ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನ, ರಸಾಯನ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ, ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದು ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಬೇಕು. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ರಸಾಯನಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ, ಸಸ್ಯಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ, ಪ್ರಾಣಿಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ, ಅರ್ಥಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ, ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಇಂಥವುಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಾಸಂಗ ಮಾಡಿ ತೇಗೇಡೆಯಾಗಿ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ, ಈಗಿರುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹು ಪುಟ್ಟ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮರೆಯಿ ತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭವಿದೆ. ಹೀಗಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ ತಾನು ಜ್ಞಾನಾರ್ಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಆ ವಿದ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ವೃತ್ತಿಗಾಗಿ ಉಪ ಯೋಗಿಸುವ ಹಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಭೌತ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ, ಮತ್ತು ರಸಾಯನಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ, ಇಂಥವುಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಾಸಂಗಮಾಡುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಪೋರ್ಟೋಗ್ರಫಿ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು, ಎಂದರೆ theoryಯನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನೇ practical ಆಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೇನೂ ಉಪಯೋಗ ದೊರಕದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಪೋರ್ಟೋ ತೆಗೆದು ಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸಬಲ್ಲೆವೆಂಬ ಧೈರ್ಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಪೋರ್ಟೋ ತೆಗೆಯುವುದು, ತೋಳಿಯು ವುದು, ಡೆವಲಪ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಮುಂತಾದ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು ಕಾರ್ಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸವಾಗಬೇಕು. ರಸಾಯನ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಬೂನು ತಯಾರಿಕೆಯ ವಿಧಾನ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಎಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ವೃತ್ತಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಹೆಚ್ಚು ದಕ್ಷರಾದ ಜನರು, ವಿದ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೈಪುಣ್ಯ ಹೊಂದಿರುವವರು, ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಭವ ಹೊಂದಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವ ಜನರು ಇಂಥವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯರಂಗ ಎಸಾರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. That will be teaching cum manufacturing. ಹೀಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಿಂದ ಹೊರಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಸಾವ್ಯ ವಾದಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನೌಕರಿಗೆ ತಲೆಬಾಗಬೇ ಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದೇಯಿರುವವರೆಗೆ, ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸುವವರೆಗೆ ದಕ್ಷತೆ ಬರಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗು ತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನು ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಳ ವಡಿಸುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಅಳವಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವ

ದಾದರೆ ಆಗ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಗ್ರಾಂಟಿನ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ non-lapsable grant ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ವಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸಮಯ ಬಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡು ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುವವರೆಗೆ ಕ್ಲಾಜು ಇಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು reduce ಎನ್ನುವ ಶಬ್ದವಿರುವುದು ಸಾಧು ವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ academic year ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಜೂನ್‌ನಿಂದ ಜನವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಳೆ ಮದೆ ರಾನು, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇತರ ಪ್ರಾಂತದವರು ಬೇರೆ ವರ್ಷವನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎಸ್.ಸಿ. ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮುಂದೆ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಸಿ. ಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಜನವರಿ ಎಂದಿಷ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜೂನ್‌ನಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ವಾದರೆ, ಜನವರಿಯಿಂದ ಜೂನ್‌ವರೆಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ ಸುಖ ರೋಲನಾಗಿ ನಿಡ್ಲೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು! ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಈ ವೈಶಿಷ್ಟ್ಯ? ಬೇಸಾಯ ವೃತ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಆಯಾ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ರಜ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ ವ್ಯಾಸಂಗ ಮಾಡು ತಿದ್ದು ಅವನಿಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನ ಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಮೀನಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವನು ರೇಷ್ಮೆ ಬೆಳೆ ಬೆಳೆಯುವವನಾದರೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಾಲ ದಲ್ಲಿ ರಜ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾರ್ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವಾಗ ರಜ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಂದೇ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ರಜ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಹುಚ್ಚುಮಾತು. ಬತ್ತ ಸೊಸಿ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ರಜ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಹತ್ತಿ ಬಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ರಜ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವೃತ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರಜ ಬೇಕಾಗ ಬಹುದು. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದ ಬೇರೆ ಭಾಗದವರು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನ ಅಧಿ ಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮದರಾಸಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗವಾದರೆ, ಅವರ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಷ ಮುಗಿಸಿ ಜನವರಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದಿನ ತರ ಗತಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ?

Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS (St. John's Hill).—I rise to a point of order, Sir. Is the Hon'ble Member speaking on the Bill or is he speaking on educational reforms?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—My friend did not follow me perhaps. I am telling you that even in this Bill provision must be made to have a uniform policy throughout. You must follow a uniform policy as far as possible.

ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದ ಇತರ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಪದ್ಧತಿ, ಏನು ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಗಳಿವೆ, ಏನು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳು ಒದರಾವಣಿಯಾಗಿವೆಯೋ ಅದ ನ್ನು ನುಸರಿಸಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ

ಬರಿಯ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ವಿಷಯ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಮೂರು ಮತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇಡೀ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿಶಾಲ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ನಮಗೆ ಯಾವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ point of order ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು ಸರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಇರುವ ಹತೋಟಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವೇನೂ ಕಣ್ಣುಮುಚ್ಚಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ autonomy ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಂಬುವಷ್ಟು ದೃಢರಲ್ಲ ನಾವು. ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಕೂಡ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ; ಮುಂದಿಡಲು ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಕೊಡಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಪೂಣ್ಣ ಅವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು, ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಕೆಲವರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರೆಗೂ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ autonomy ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಅದು ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, autonomy ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳಿವೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಉತ್ತಮವೆಂದು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ವಿಧಾನಗಳನ್ನು ನುಸರಿಸಿ, ಆಗಿಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ನುಸರಿಸುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು “ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಸ್ವೇಚ್ಛೆಯಿಂದ ಉತ್ತಮವೆಡಿಸಿ; ನಾವು ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ; ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿ; 250 ರೂಪಾಯಿನಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಡಿ ರೀಡರ್‌ಗಳೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿ” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದ್ಯಾವುದನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದು, ನೀವೇ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದೇನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರು ದಕ್ಷರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಅವರು ಉತ್ತಮವೆಡಿಸಿದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅನುಕೂಲವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಮಸೂದೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿ ಇದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಹುಡುಗರಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಸಂತೋಷ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ತಂದಿರುವ ಮಸೂದೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಮುಂದೆ ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. Non-lapsable and definite grant to the University is necessary, subject to its being increased and not decreased or reduced; increased wherever necessity arises ಎನ್ನುವ provision ಇರಬೇಕು.

L.A.

University Council or its Chancellor, even the appointment of the Chancellor should be left to the House. Get a panel of names. Let the Chancellor be elected. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಚುನಾಯಿತ ಬಾನ್ಸೆಲರ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿ. Chancellor shall be nominated by the Government ಎಂದು ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥ. ಇನ್ನು ಮೇಲೆ ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖರು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಹೋಯಿತು. ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾರಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರಬೇಕು;

ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು; ಆಗ ಎಲ್ಲವೂ ಲೇಬರ್‌ಯವರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ

Mr. SPEAKER.—But they are agreeable.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Chancellor must be independent of the Government and the grant must be a non-lapsable definite grant.

ಇಷ್ಟು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಬೇಕಾಗಿವೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕಂಡ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಆ ವಿವರಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾನೀಗ ಹೋಗಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T. Narasipur).—Mr. Speaker, I rise to place before this House my views on the University Bill. I have raised this issue several times on the floor of this House that autonomy should be granted to the University. From the pre-partition days, Universities have increased in India. Prior to the partition of India, there were only 21 Universities in India and today we have nearly 30 Universities throughout India and the number of colleges have also similarly increased. There were about 414 colleges previously and today we have got nearly 417 colleges. It is all the more necessary that we should make University an autonomous institution. The Bill does not grant that autonomy in full. There are certain reservations made there. I deal with them presently. I cannot understand why the Government did not make a provision for the election of Vice-Chancellor. Vice-Chancellor was being appointed by Chancellor even before. The Bill contains provisions for a similar thing. So, there is absolutely no change. The Vice-Chancellor is the person who presides

(SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)

on almost all University authorities; he is the chief executive officer and why should we not make a place for the election of the Vice-Chancellor? No provision has been made in this Bill so far as the elected place is concerned.

Sir, the Bill seeks to create some new appointments. One is that of the Bursar and the other is that of the Controller of Examinations. No additional point is gained. The Controller of Examinations works under the Vice-Chancellor and the decision of the Bursar is not final. So, why should we create statutorily new posts? The administration of the University is being carried on now by the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar. They can continue the same thing. There is absolutely no additional point gained by creating a statutorily new posts called the Controller of Examinations and the Bursar.

Sir, I now pass on to the authorities of the universities. Some changes have no doubt been made. Instead of the University Council, we have the Syndicate. But from the provisions of the Bill it can be seen that we have taken a retrograde step in respect of elected element in these authorities. In the Senate, as it now stands today, the elected element consists of 21 members and according to the Bill it gets reduced to 16. This House used to send nine members; if the Bill is accepted it will send only six members. The Upper House used to send three members; if the Bill is accepted it will send only two to the Senate. Did Government really want to have a body like that to deprive the powers of this House? I really cannot understand why the elected elements in these two bodies have been reduced. That could never be accepted. Even, as a matter of fact, the Syndicate, the Senate and the Academic Council had the right to elect five members—three members from the Senate and two from the Academic Council. Now, according to the provision of this Bill, that number has been reduced to four. The Senate selects only three and the Academic Council selects only one. I want to know why the elected element is

sought to be reduced. It must be enhanced. In fact in some of the authorities the nominated element is increased. That must be certainly discouraged. Sir, in this Bill we have no doubt created what is called a "Board of Appointments", but its functions are limited by the rules framed by the Vice-Chancellor. Why should the Vice-Chancellor frame rules for the conduct of the business of a statutory body? If the object of the Government in creating a statutory body is to make it autonomous, why should that statutory body conduct its affairs in accordance with the rules framed by the Chancellor who is not responsible to that statutory body? There must be something else. I am asking: are you really serious to grant autonomy to University? No, Sir. As Sri Bheemappa Naik has put it, if the Chancellor of the University should be the Rajpramukh of the State, all decisions of the University should directly go to the Chancellor through the Government. I can understand that there is absolutely no harm in having the Rajpramukh as the Chancellor, but if all correspondence that has to be referred to him has to pass through the Government, then it is as good as saying that the Government is fully interested.

Sir, I shall speak about the Board of Appointments. From the provisions of this Bill, we see that very good suggestions have been made. The Professors concerned, the Principals of the Departments and Specialists from other parts of India will be invited. These are all very good provisions. I perfectly agree. When an expert body decides about the appointments, where is the meaning in those appointments being approved by the Chancellor? Why should the Chancellor approve? The nature of the appointment, the qualification required for the appointment, and the actual interview, everything will be done by the Expert Body; almost they have the power to appoint whomsoever they choose. Why should the decisions of the Board of Appointments be submitted to the Chancellor? That portion of it is not certainly in consonance with the

democratic principles or the autonomous character that the Government desires to confer on the University.

Sir, the Hon'ble Minister, while making his speech, no doubt said that the academic freedom, the administrative freedom and the financial freedom have been conceded. I have touched on this point in my budget speech in the Budget session of the Assembly and he was also pleased to look at me drawing my attention that I had made a reference to it or perhaps it might be a mere coincidence. Academic freedom certainly has been conceded to a certain extent. All amendments to the statutes, ordinances or any of these things had to be submitted to Government for approval under section 21 of the University Act of 1933. Now it is not necessary. They have absolute freedom now. But those decisions of the Senate have to be approved by the Chancellor. Unless the Chancellor approves or assents, they cannot execute. Statutes, Ordinances and Regulations are being drafted by the several authorities for the proper conduct of the business of the University. And why should not those statutory bodies be empowered to draft statutes, ordinances or regulations in order to implement what is contained in this Act? Therefore, the approval of the Rajpramukh need not be insisted on these things.

Sir, I pass on to the Social Service Board. Social Service is no doubt a very welcome feature, but why should there be a separate board constituted under a statute to enforce it? There is the Syndicate, the University Council and there is the Senate. The Senate has the authority to pass resolution as regards the budget of the University. Why should there be a Social Service Board solely for the purpose of conducting the social services. The University can as well do it. Such a separate body is unnecessary; it serves no useful purpose. Even granting that the principle of social service is conceded, I would like to tell you that it acts very hard upon the poor students. The poor students will have certainly tried their level best to see that they get more financial

accommodation till they graduated themselves, but, after their graduation, they cannot pass on to earn their livelihood in view of the fact that they have to put compulsory social service for one year. No indication has been made as to how they can maintain themselves in that period. It can be very hard for the poor students. It may be all right for those who are financially well up. Therefore this Social Service Board need not be made statutory.

Sir, I would like to speak something about the University Fund. If the Bill is accepted, the University will be free to receive grants not only from the Government of India, but from any other University in India and also from the Government of Mysore. It is very good that the Bill seeks to make the grant non-lapsable. No doubt they have reserved the power to vary the powers, but in turn this Legislature must have the power to cut the grant if they so desire or to enhance the grant if they feel that the grant is insufficient. As Sri Naik has very well put it in that connection, I too consider that the rights to curtail the grant should be deleted. Certainly, no statutory provision is required. If this House feels that the additional grant is inevitable, then it can certainly grant it.

2-30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—So far as the grant is concerned, the ultimate authority is the House. If it so desires, it can increase the grant.

SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Why should there be a provision in this Bill? The payment of grant or the amount of grant has to be fixed by this House in the course of the budget discussion. Why should there be a separate provision in this Bill empowering the Government to curtail it or enhance it? Payment of additional money need not be based on a statutory provision. It is based on a decision of this House. This House agrees to enhance the grant and the University receives it. There is nothing in this Bill to say that the University should not receive anything. But I have an objection to

(SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)
the grant being cut. Even there the House must have a restriction on that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am seriously putting this question whether it is admissible to put a limitation on the privileges of this House not to cut. If the House so desires, it can do so. Is it admissible to put a limitation on the privileges of the House?

SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Supposing a provision of that type is not made in the Bill. In the absence of a provision, is it not possible for this House either to cut it or raise it? So why should there be a specific provision in this Bill? There must be a purpose. If the Government by itself in virtue of its executive power does it, we should not allow it. The Legislature has the supreme power to consider this in the course of the budget discussion. Supposing a provision of that nature is not contained in this Bill, it does not mean that this House will not have the power. That is a point that has to be examined. I feel that that provision may not be necessary. Suffice it to say that the Government desires to give a non-lapsable amount. That is a very good thing.

Mr. SPEAKER.—By making an amendment to that effect in clause (b) you are limiting the privileges and the powers of the future body, *i.e.*, the Legislature. If the future House has no power even to decrease it, to that extent you will be limiting the powers of the future House.

SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Non-lapsable grant is given year by year. The expenditure is to be approved by this House. Whatever amount this House gives, it becomes a non-lapsable grant to the University. Therefore, the question of decreasing or increasing it does not arise. There, at that stage, the House decides and the Government gives the amount to the University as a non-lapsable grant. Therefore no power is necessary there.

In the University in their common seal we see one thing, and that is “ನಿಷ್ಕಂ ಜ್ಞಾನೇನ ಸದೃಶಂ” “There is nothing comparable to knowledge.” The provisions of this Bill should be so

framed as to see that this ideal is not lost sight of. The University must purely be an educational institution designed to give higher knowledge and train persons. Therefore, such feelings as would come in the way of the implementation of this ideal should not be encouraged.

The Government have visitorial powers. On a perusal of the section, I find that the Government do not seem to have conceded anything. Under section 19, they have those powers. They have re-introduced them in this Bill perhaps with certain additions to make themselves still more powerful and therefore the Government have lost very little by this Bill. In the administrative frame as I have already said, by constituting the Board of Appointments they have certainly given up their power. Under section 14 they had reserved the powers relating to appointments, leave, etc. Now by deleting it and handing over the power to the Board of Appointments they have certainly sacrificed something and it is welcome. Therefore, I said that in respect of the academic frame, administrative frame and the financial frame, there seems to be a little concession. The Government have parted with certain powers. Even in respect of services, the University maintains Pension Fund. I am glad that provision has been made for the payment of pensions to the retired officers prior to the coming of this Bill. It is a very good thing. For such of those that retire in future after this Bill comes into law, it is the University Fund that will be responsible to pay their pensions. I entirely agree with the Government that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, because many more things have to be discussed and at this stage it may not be possible to cover almost all the provisions numbering about 66 or 69 clauses. In virtue of the limitation of time and the importance of the Bill, it is good that the Bill has to go to a Select Committee.

SRI V. M. MASCARENHAS (St. John's Hill).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the University Bill is before us and I must say that it has tended to reform in a way the present

University administration and try to put our University in a new set up. My friend Sri Bheemappa Naik was rather critical in respect of many of its clauses. His bitterest criticism was on the non-lapsable grant and I think my friend Srinivasa Iyengar also followed in the same strain. I do not think the Government meant that they would reduce the sums of money that are needed for University purposes and my way of looking at it is that on page 22 if only one word namely 'recurring' could be added to the word 'expenditure', I think the whole trouble could be got over. I have known in the University the lapse occurs greatly in the case of building grants. As Sri Bheemappa Naik pointed out, the Engineering Department being the biggest sinner, very often the University grant lapses because the buildings do not come up at all. But not a pie is saved so far as the recurring expenditure is concerned. If in this clause the word 'recurring' is added, I think it will meet all opposition.

Coming to the new body that has been formed in the University, namely, the Board of Appointments, it is a very happy body consisting of really eminent men and making it possible to augment the chances of first rate men being appointed to the University. But my doubt begins when Sri Bheemappa Naik says "Make that body's recommendation subordinate to the Council." I beg to differ, because, if, as we know, an expert body has taken the trouble of appointing Professors and Assistant Professors, I do not wish that their recommendations should be scrutinised by a less expert body like the University Council. Their recommendations should simply go to the Chancellor for, what I would say, formal approval, because I do not normally expect that the Chancellor would sit in judgment over the recommendations of an expert body; but being the head of the University he would give it his seal and approval.

There is one clause in the Bill that has been added, namely, Social Service Board. This has raised a number of doubtful questions in the minds of

many members and I am also one of them. It is very good to say on paper that we should have social service, that our young men and women in the University should render service to the country, but when you translate this into action I have my doubts as to what shape this Service will take. It was pointed out that we have 10,000 students now in the University. How are these 10,000 students to render social service; is it at the end of their career or is it in every year of their University course. What is the agency which determines the nature of this Service and what is the agency that determines the successful termination of this Service? These are problems that will confront the University and unless the Bill makes it a little clearer as to what exactly is in the minds of the Government, I am afraid it may give room for very many undesirable results. I perfectly agree that to-day, in an independent India, when our country is advancing, young men and women, specially in the schools and colleges, should render service to the country. But in doing so let us not forget that we should canalise these actions, canalise this effort into really useful channel which would do, in the long run, good to the country.

Coming now to the formation of the Syndicate and the Senate, there has been criticism by some members that practically the old order continues and the hand of Government is still to be seen. I perhaps would say that such a hand is desirable for the simple reason that when a large sum of money to the tune of nearly Rs. 50 lakhs is being given by the State for the purpose of the University my personal view is that some kind of a control is necessary in the interests of the State and its tax-payers. I understand Sri Bheemappa Naik's argument that to-day the clerk in the Education Secretary's office plays a more important part than the Education Minister himself. That is true. But such a state of affairs is to be avoided or it is to be remedied. I however still say that the Government, as a final authority, should have a voice in the affairs of the

(SRI V. M. MASCOLENHAS)

University and make sure that the large sums of money allotted to the University are well spent, and, that the Syndicate and the Senate are carrying on their work in the best interests of the State.

We have also a new body called the Controller of Examinations, and the Bursar. I am inclined to agree with my Hon'ble friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar as to why there should be need for two statutory appointments in this Bill. The Vice-Chancellor has the final voice in the University Administration. He could have one or two officers or an extra Assistant Registrar who could be given this specific work under his direction. As long as the Controller of Examinations continues to be under the Vice-Chancellor, merely calling one man by that name, I do not think, will give any special significance to him. He could continue to work under the University and without being called by that name, he could carry on his duties as such.

There is one more thing I want to say. Year after year, we are seeing a larger number of students in our colleges and also a larger number of colleges is coming up. If this is the case, the Government naturally have a heavier responsibility on their shoulders. To take an average of the previous three years and fix the grant, will, in my opinion, not be very right. I have been always seeing in the Senate that 18 affiliated colleges in the State are today being given a step-motherly treatment by the University while the Government colleges are comparatively well-off. After all, affiliated colleges render a duty to the State. Just as much, if not a little more efficiently than the Government colleges; but compare the grants that they get for the services they render. I would earnestly appeal to the Government that affiliated colleges must in future come under a more generous patronage than in the past. With these few words, I resume my seat.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY (Mysore City South).— Mr. Speaker, Sir, I take it, that this Bill has been introduced to tone up the Univer-

sity administration, to raise the standard of University education and as far as possible to make the University more responsible for the administration of the University. Sir, my Hon'ble friend Sri Bheemappa Naik and my friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar harped upon the word 'autonomy'. Sir, in my opinion, the word 'autonomy' has lost a good deal of significance by making use of it too often. It has been very loosely used. Under the present set up, and the way we are living and the way of life we are leading, no individual or no institution can remain autonomous in the sense the dictionary defines the word 'autonomy'. Sir, it is admitted that the Mysore University is to be fed by public funds and controlled by the Legislature which is the sovereign body to vote for the grants that are placed before the House by Government. When that is the case, so long as the University depends for its funds not on private donations or private funds but on public funds, it has to be controlled by one authority, namely, Legislature which will work through its executive *viz.*, the Government. Sir, let us not make a fetish of the word 'autonomy'. It is no use saying that the Rajpramukh is the Chancellor or the Government have the ultimate authority. It has to be so. Supposing, Sir, for arguments' sake, as my Hon'ble friend Sri Bheemappa Naik said, the Chancellor also is to be elected, are we here to see that a Chancellor or a Vice-Chancellor becomes an autocrat, behaves as he pleases not to be controlled by any authority? If that be so, why should the University go before the Legislature for its funds? Supposing the University is made autonomous and nobody is to control the administration or the way the amount is spent, how are the members of this Hon'ble House to know how it is spent? So, it is no use saying that the University should be made an autonomous body. I have read the Bill and I see that Government, while placing this Bill, have deeply considered and pondered over the subject and have tried their best to make the University autonomous as far as possible. They

have given autonomy so far as admissions of students are concerned, so far as internal administration is concerned, and so far as examinations are concerned. Beyond that, the word 'autonomy' will have no place in the University administration. Sir, as a matter of fact, I am glad that this University Bill has been brought more with a view to tone up the administration of the University and make it feel that it should be more responsible not only to the Government but to the people who give the necessary fund to run the administration. I do not want to recount the way the University administration is being run. I know, Sir, it would be a very sorry tale to recount the way in which the University administration is going on now and if this is the way the University will be functioning, woe be to those who study in that University. The way in which the standard of the students is maintained appears to be very sorrowful. I am sorry, I forgot to bring a postcard that has been written to me by a student who has recently passed the M.A. examination in Politics. If I only read that letter which he has written in English, that will show the standard of English or the standard of teaching that the University is giving to their students. He has spelt the word 'caree' as 'carrier'. With the permission of the Hon'ble Speaker I will read that letter tomorrow. That shows in what way the degrees are conferred, examinations are being held and the students are being made to pass. It is very funny that he is unable to distinguish between 'quite' and 'quieter'. If really autonomy is to be given to the University, I am sure that the student that will be trained under this autonomous university. . . .

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—Spelling has nothing to do with autonomous University.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—That has everything to do with the University. I am coming to the point why the University has not been able to devote as much attention to the proper administration of teaching because University administration is full of politics, full of cliques and full of

communal troubles. If only the teacher and the taught were brought together properly and teachers maintained that respect, maintained that dignity, and the student is not allowed to go on in an indisciplined manner, University administration would not have come to this stage.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Maddur).—Will autonomy improve all these things?

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—If autonomy is given it will go worse.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is the opinion of the Hon'ble Member.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—I am sorry to say all these things. I have felt and I have sincerely felt that the University which was started in 1916 is not the same University now and if the University administration is to be toned up, if the University is to be enthused with true spirit of dignity of labour and self-respect, some of the provisions that are incorporated in this Bill are very good in that direction. But how far the provisions of this Bill could be implemented is a matter that has to be seen. It all depends upon the administrators who administer the University. Sir, if one reads the Statement of Objects and Reasons he will find these words; "since the previous Mysore University Act, 1933 was brought into force, great changes have occurred in the political, economic and social life of the country and the University has to be remodelled in response to these changes" 'Remodelled in response to these changes'—does it mean that the University should be an independent body, an autonomous body free from all concerned and it should not be integrated with the activities of other Departments of Government? So long as we have got a responsible Government, responsible to the Legislature, any Department, or any institution that derives benefit from public funds should be under the control of the Legislature and so the question of autonomy does not arise at all. It is stated thus in the Statement of Objects and Reasons:—

"The question of the reform of the University Education has been

(SRI B. NARAYANASWAMY.)

recently considered by many expert bodies and persons such as the University Education Commission, Dr. C. R. Reddy, the Mysore Education Reforms Committee and the Central Advisory Board of Education. After a careful consideration of these reports it is proposed to reorganise the University as in the Bill in order to enable it to efficiently discharge the great functions entrusted to it."

The words 'in order to enable it to efficiently discharge the great functions entrusted to it' should be noted. This University is meant to train the future citizens to bear greater responsibility, to maintain and preserve our independence and the great glory that has been with us now and with this view the University Bill is to be examined.

MR. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet at 3-30 P.M.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

SRI B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Sir, I was reading the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

"With a view to train students for properly discharging the responsibility of citizenship and in conformity with the trend towards a socialistic pattern of society, and to impart the idea of the dignity of labour, provision has been made for compulsory free social service for a prescribed period. To achieve this end, a Social Service Board will be set up.

Other important features of this Bill are—

(1) Provisions to endow the University with autonomous powers, among other matters, with regard to—

(a) admission of students to the University;

(b) regulation of the courses of study;

(c) constitution of University Service; and

(d) the creation of a University Fund with non-lapsable annual grants made by the Government."

Non-lapsable annual grant made by Government—there cannot be a greater autonomy than this. I am unable to understand when my Hon'ble friend Sri. Bheemappa Naik said that there should be greater autonomy than what is mentioned in this Bill. As a matter of fact, even under the existing Act, there is, so far as admission of students for the University is concerned, an infringement of autonomy. Sometimes complaints have been made that Government interfere with regard to the admission of students to the University. And that is a fact. I know several cases where the Government have interfered, as matter of fact, imposed their will regarding the admission of students to the technical colleges, especially the Medical College and the Medical School. I know a case where a member who was in the University Council became a member of the Medical College and used his influence to admit a relation of his own, though he had no merit. The student who had no merit was admitted to the Medical College because a member who was in the University Council, who became a member of the Medical College influenced the committee to get admission. As a matter of fact, last year, there was an interpellation on this subject and the Government was pleased to accept that there was a complaint against the member. Now in this Bill, the University will be made autonomous so far as the admission of students is concerned. I am sure the Government will not interfere or impose their will regarding the admission of students to the University. Sir, this question of admission of students to the University should be treated very seriously. If really we want to raise the standards of

University Education, we have to take all possible care to see that students who really deserve and who have merit should be admitted to the University. I am sure that with this object in view Government have now incorporated in this Bill that autonomy would be given to the University to have their own way regarding the admission of students. It is to be seen how far the University would maintain this autonomy.

My humble request to the authorities of the University would be to maintain the proper standard of University Education and see that students who really deserve and who have merit should alone be admitted to the University.

Regarding the regulation of the courses of study, Government have at no time interfered. The Academic Council from the beginning has been an autonomous body. The Academic Council usually consists of educational experts, mostly professors and principals of several colleges. It is this Academic Council that prescribes the curriculum and the courses of study. So far as my knowledge goes, Government at no time have interfered with regard to the courses of study. It is only the University Council or the Academic Council that have made the changes in the courses of study. I would like to bring to the notice of this House an instance. A few years back, in the Maharaja's College, a particular subject was introduced and several students were admitted to the course. All of a sudden, the Academic Council decided to put an end to that course. If this is the way the courses of study are being administered or regulated, then it would mean a good deal of difficulty to the students.

Further, this Bill contemplates the constitution of University Service. It is really very good.

The Bill provides for the appointment of a Board of Appointments. Section 26 of the Bill reads :

“The Board of Appointments.—

(1) Appointments to the teaching staff of the University shall be made in accordance with rules made by the Chancellor in consul-

tation with the Syndicate and the Mysore Public Service Commission; and for the purpose of making such appointments there shall be a Board of Appointments consisting of the following members namely, etc.”

Here, there is a happy introduction of an additional element, namely, the Mysore Public Service Commission. It is a happy blending and in this University Bill, I see that a balanced administration is contemplated. It is contemplated that the University will neither become too autonomous nor too subordinate and at the same time Government will also have some authority or some control over the University because it is Government funds that are administered by the University. Regarding the Board of Appointments, my only objection would be: no doubt experts are included in this Board, but their decisions will only become finalised by the approval of the Vice-Chancellor. In between the Chancellor and the Board of Appointments, there is the University Syndicate. Under the provisions of the Act, the Syndicate is the authority to administer or the executive authority to have control over the University Administration. I do not know why the framers of this Bill have overlooked the authority of the Syndicate over this matter. It would be appropriate that an appointment that is made by the Board of Appointments should be recommendatory and the University Council should be the final authority for finalising the appointment. I think Sri Bheemappa Naik was perfectly right when he said that the University Syndicate, which is a powerful the body, which, as a matter of fact, is overall controlling authority of the University administration, has been overlooked, so far as appointments are concerned. If that be the case, I think Government have to reconsider their view regarding the powers that they are going to give to the Board of Appointments.

Finally, the University is autonomous so far as the finances are concerned,

(SRI B. NARAYANASWAMY)
and the administration of the University Funds are concerned. The creation of a University Fund with non-lapsable grants made by Government — what more can the University expect than this? Government have been very very generous in a sense that much of their powers has been given up. Now that a non-lapsable fund is going to be created under this Act, the University will have full power to administer those funds.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Please read 38 (b).

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—It is regarding the grants.

“If the Government after such enquiry as it deems fit is satisfied that there is a reduction or increase in the expenditure of the University in any year, it may, reduce or increase the grant, as the case may be.”

Instead of saying ‘Government,’ it should be said ‘Legislature’. It should not be left to the Government either to reduce or increase the grant.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I agree.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—If you take objection to the word ‘Government’ I would rather prefer to put the words ‘by the vote of the Legislature’. Legislature has got the right of voting, and can either increase or reduce the grant.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no difference. Government means Legislature.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Government means Legislature. Legislature means Government. In that case, my friend Sri Bheemappa Naik can have no objection. When Legislature has the power to increase or decrease the grants. . . .

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Where is the question of non-lapsable grant? What is the meaning of that word? Why do you oppose that word?

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Non-lapsable grant has every meaning, because when once the legislature votes a particular grant, the University has

got the right to spend the amount. Usually what happens is this

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a vast difference no doubt.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Non-lapsable grant means whatever is allotted will be distributed. It is only after enquiry the amount would be reduced or the same amount continues. Now at present, it is going on changing from year to year which shall not happen now. That is the distinction made here. Therefore the apprehension that it might be decreased arbitrarily is not there: the apprehension that the amount not spent for the previous year will be taken back by the Government is not there. Therefore there is a gulf between the lapsable grant and the non-lapsable grant.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I will be satisfied if whatever grant is given must be allowed to be spent by the University authorities. That is not the criterion on which you are making an enquiry for the reduction or otherwise. The need and the minimum requirements must be assured every year so that they might create an University Fund. If you assure that much, we will be satisfied.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I am assuring almost that much. I may illustrate a point here. At one time in the Sugar Technology Institute it so happened that in one year the Department asked for more grants. We have got to enquire and find out whether that amount is necessary and after such enquiry, it may become necessary to allot more grants or to cut the grants. Since they are depending upon Government for a long time to come, the University will have to depend on our grants for opening new courses. Should we not then increase the grant? Therefore there is a difference. What has been defined here will satisfy all the normal requirements and the future development of the University.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Under the non-lapsable grant there will be a good deal of opportunity to build up their funds as it would not lapse. Usually what is happening is this: The Legislature votes for nearly 30 to

45 lakhs of rupees every year and the University would spend about 30 lakhs of rupees and Rs. 15 lakhs would lapse. Under the non-lapsable grant, the amount will not lapse and the University will have an opportunity to build up their own fund. In that way, the University will have derived a good deal of autonomy. As a matter of fact, for the administration of finance, this Bill has contemplated an independent committee like the Finance Committee.

Sir, even for the examinations, the Bill contemplates the appointment of a Controller of Examinations. I want to ask, in what way the creation of the post would reduce or would minimise the present irregularities that we are hearing about these examinations? And I wish that the Minister for Education would kindly tell us how the creation of a new post like the Controller of Examination would help to minimise the series of scandals or the irregularities that we often hear regarding the examinations. Recently Sir, we have heard that the Law Examination was postponed on account of irregularities committed by an examiner. What an enormous amount had been spent for setting up papers! Some of the students who had passed after correction, were made to fail. Later I am told that the examination that was held previously and the students who had failed were made to pass and that they have come to join the B.L. class. I do not want this state of affairs to continue. If the appointment of the Controller of Examinations would avoid all such irregularities and scandals, I think, the purpose would be served by the appointment of an officer. But there is no meaning in simply creating new posts like the Bursar, two Assistant Registrars and the Controller of Examinations and I do not know what other officers they are going to create hence forward. Anyhow these are the matters that the Hon'ble Members have to deeply consider before coming to a decision, whether there is any necessity to have an officer like the Controller of Examinations. Who is the authority who recommends for the appointment of the Controller of Exa-

minations? The Bill provides that the Vice-Chancellor will recommend for this appointment. Under this Bill, I would like to say that the Vice-Chancellor is made a dictator virtually; several appointments have to be made on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; even the Controller of Examinations who is considered to be an independent officer, just like a judicial officer, will be appointed on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor. And I think, we have to change the method of appointment of the Controller of Examinations and the Vice-Chancellor should not be the authority and the authority to appoint them should be the University Council; or the best authority would be the University Syndicate. The Syndicate is responsible for the administration of the University and they should be held responsible for the proper working of the University and they should appoint the Controller of Examinations and not on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor. Even with regard to appointments, with great regret I have to say certain things. My only hope is that under the provisions of the Bill the irregularities will be rectified. What is happening now, Sir? The University Council will appoint a Special Committee for the appointment of Assistant Professors or the Professors. There will be two specialists and two members of the University Council. Regularly there will be tug of war between the non-academic members and the academic members. Finally, what happens is that the Special Committee will not recommend any of the candidates; they will say that none of these candidates are fit to hold posts of Professors or Assistant Professors. But finally the very University Council will recommend one of those who is rejected by the Special Committee and the Government will approve it. That should not be the way. When once a Special Committee rejects a candidate that he is not fit for a post, he should be completely rejected. I know a case, Sir, where the University had advertised for the post of a Professor of

(SRI B. NARAYANASWAMY.)

Politics. There were two candidates for that post. As a matter of fact the Special Committee interviewed them and in the interview, one of the candidates was asked to spell the name of the University in which he had studied; but unfortunately he mis-spelt the word. Finally, Sir, that Special Committee reported to the University Council that none of the candidates were fit to become Professors. But later on I learnt, Sir, that the University Council had recommended to Government for the appointment of one of the candidates and the Government have appointed that person as a Probationary professor. If in the same way the Board of Appointments works, I think, the very purpose of this Bill will not be served. Our whole idea is that the administration of the University and the relationship between the students and the Professors should be very cordial, harmonious and commanding good deal of respect. It is for that purpose that we are striving and the Government have brought forward this Bill to see that that standard is attained and if that is not attained, there is no use in passing such a Bill.

Sir, I quote another instance. When the post of the Professor for Sanskrit was advertised, as a matter of fact, a Special Committee was appointed by the University Council. Again the same trouble arose. The man who was the senior-most Assistant Professor who had put in good deal of service as Assistant Professor was not selected. The Supernumerary Assistant Professor who was found inferior to the other man was proposed. Unfortunately, Sir, that man died and the question is still pending. Why I am saying all these things is not to wound the feelings of the authorities concerned. I have great respect for the University authorities for the Vice-Chancellor and other Professors and Principals of the Colleges, but I am only expressing my views on this subject. When the Bill is placed before this House, we should see that those irregularities should not creep up and no room should be given for mal-administration of the Univer-

sity. And as such, Sir, it is my earnest desire that when this Bill is referred to the Joint Select Committee, they should see that some of the anomalous provisions in this Bill are removed. The Statement of Objects and Reasons also further states that there is a provision for reconstitution of the several authorities of the University, the composition of the several authorities and provision has been made to provide for the proper representation of the academic and the non-academic elements and to ensure the maintenance of proper standards. It is a very good object. The method of selection of members provided in the Bill is also advantageous.

Now, Sir, from reading this Bill, I do not see any difference between the constitution of the several University authorities that exist now and the provisions made in this Bill. The constitution of the senate remains the same and the name "University Council" is changed into "Syndicate". Instead of 'University Council' they have called it a 'Syndicate' which will be a full-fledged body consisting of Principals and Professors. Out of fifteen members that would constitute the University Council, nearly nine of them are academic men, *viz.*, Principals or the Professors of University Colleges. The other six members are non-Academic members. It should be more representative, Sir.

Perhaps the Hon'ble Members might have read Dr. C. R. Reddy's Report on the Education Reforms; he has definitely stated that no staff member should be on this Syndicate, no Principal should be on the University Syndicate because they should have nothing to do with the University administration. It is here that we find that conflicts will arise between the academic and non-academic men. Here we see the hand of politics; here we see the hand of cliques and it will completely demoralise not only the University administration but also the student population. The reason why there has been so much of indiscipline among the students is because there has not been proper relationship between the students and the teachers. I know cases, Sir, where teachers and

professors unnecessarily interfere or try to meddle with the students. That should not be the way. And I think my friend Sri K. Puttaswamy does not want me to say all these things. But it is my duty to say before this House what I feel. I cannot say this elsewhere. Being an Hon'ble Member of this House it is my duty to bring it to the notice of the Government and this Hon'ble House what is really happening there. Our entire desire is to see that there should be proper relationship between the students and the professors.

Sir, we remember the days when we also studied in the colleges and we know how we have behaved with our Principals and Professors. And today, Sir, we see a sorry picture. The Professor or a teacher is not in a position to control or to command the same respect as in former days.

4 P.M.

What is the reason? It is for the University authorities to go into this question and find out why there has been a fall in that standard and if this Bill will really help us to solve all these problems I am sure it will be going a long way to enhance the reputation of the University and in achieving the objects and reasons that are mentioned in this Bill. What we want is that the students that are studying in the University should become good citizens of India, citizens capable of administering the country, capable of bearing the burdens that will be on their heads some time hence; it is that type of students that we have to train. I am glad that this Bill contemplates the element of dignity of labour and to implement this, they have provided that there should be a Social Service Board, that it is made compulsory for students to take training in the social service camp or Social Service Board. It is strange why this Board bears no relationship with the University body. It seems to be an independent body. Section 30:

“Establishment of Social Service Board,—

(1) There shall be established a Board called the ‘Social Service

Board’ consisting of a Chairman and such other members as the Rajpramukh may by notification in the *Mysore Gazette* appoint.”

It is here that we have to disagree. When we are entrusting a responsible body like the University to teach and train the minds of students, why not we entrust this Social Service Board to the University itself; why should there be a separate body appointed by the Rajpramukh? We know that appointment by Rajpramukh means appointment by Government and I do not see any relationship or co-ordination between this Board and the University authorities.

“(2) The Chairman and the Members of the Board shall hold office subject to such terms and conditions as the Rajpramukh may by rules determine.”

Why the Rajpramukh? Why not the Chancellor? Why this difference? What is the reason? What is it that made the Government to remove the word ‘Chancellor’? Why is it that they have said that it is left to the Rajpramukh to appoint this Board? The Hon'ble Minister for Education, I think, will tell us the reason that has prompted the framers of this Bill, why they want to have a Social Service Board which is independent of the University. Section 31:

“Powers of the Social Service Board—(1) The Social Service Board shall have—

(a) power to enforce compulsory and free social service from students of the University required to render social service under clause (m) of section 17 for such period not exceeding one year as may be prescribed by rules made by the said Board;

(b) the control and general regulation of the programmes of social service to be rendered and shall exercise such powers and perform such duties as may be necessary for the said purposes.

(2) In particular and without prejudice to the generality of

(SRI B. NARAYANASWAMY.)

powers conferred by sub-section (1), the Social Service Board shall have the following powers, namely,—

(a) to incur such expenditure as may be necessary to implement the programmes of social service;

(b) to appoint, subject to such rules as may be made by the Government, such staff as may be necessary to carry out the programmes of social service;

(c) to cause to be maintained proper accounts relating to the receipts and expenditure of the Board;

(d) to prepare the financial estimates of the Board and submit the same to the Government;

(e) to grant certificates to persons who have rendered social services. . . .”

The Joint Select Committee has to consider this point.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I do not know why he objects to Government doing all these when he does not want autonomy. He says that autonomy is given and what more is required. Here he says that Government should not do it. What is this contradiction? If autonomy is there with the Government, it is also here with the Government.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—I cannot help it if contradiction is in the mind of Sri Bheemappa Naik. My submission is that in this Bill this provision for the appointment of a Social Service Board has no relationship with the University Bill or the University. In what way they want to implement or bring in relationship between the University and the Social Service Board, is not mentioned at all. It is the Rajpramukh that appoints this Board; it is the Government that finances it. Why should it find a place in this Bill? They can bring a separate Bill. Is it their object to attach this to Bharat Sevadal? Government should be very specific in telling us why they want that the Service Board should have an independent place, not related to the

University administration. It is for the Joint Select Committee to consider all these points. I have, to a little extent, covered some of the provisions of this Bill and my only hope is that, if the objects and reasons that are mentioned in this Bill are truly carried out under the provisions of this Bill, I think the purpose will be served and I support this Bill.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should not have ordinarily thought of offering any remark on this Bill but for one circumstance and that is, that, in the course of the debate since this morning, certain misgivings have been expressed and some of them of a very fundamental nature and I really felt that I should express my reactions to some of these observations made in that manner. Two of them came from my Hon'ble friend Sri Bheemappa Naik. One is, he seems to feel that taking the composition and the nature of the Bill as it is, this autonomy is circumscribed to a very great extent. He felt that the pre-condition of getting grants from the Grants Commission, namely, that a University should be autonomous, had fallen down in its standard and performance here, with the result that the Mysore University that is going to emerge as a result of this Bill might suffer for this particular reason. I felt that this is a matter which required a great deal of thought and clear clarification. I personally feel from my perusal and my reading of the Bill that I do not subscribe to the view of Sri Bheemappa Naik that this Bill does not envisage autonomy in the sense in which we want that word to be understood and that therefore there is a possibility, there is an apprehension, as he wants to make out, that the Grants Commission might not favour the Mysore University with grants as it was not autonomous. This raises another important question also. As we are now concerned more with the general principles of a Bill of this kind, I should like certain clarifications to be made. One of them is, I wholeheartedly agree with my friend the Hon'ble Member from Mysore City, Sri B. Narayanaswamy in saying that we do no

seem to have understood —each of us— in the same manner, this phrase ‘Autonomy in a University’—. Autonomy in what respects? autonomy to what extent? autonomy to effectuate what purposes? —these are certain fundamental considerations which we have got to bear in mind when we really think of autonomy of a University. If by that standard when we judged and analysed the several provisions of this Bill we come unmistakably to the conclusion that in certain of these respects the Bill fell short, then our criticisms would be perfectly justified and we would have a strong case for reconsideration and modification of the Bill entirely. My own feeling as I could see from the Bill is that there is an honest and a serious attempt made in the course of this Bill to give autonomy to the University in matters in which the University ought to be supreme. In fact in academic matters, in administrative matters, in the way in which the funds of the University are going to be administered —these are certain aspects with which a University is principally concerned. In respect of those matters I am sure there cannot be two opinions that this Bill gives autonomy. There is the other question: this autonomy is related to the kindred and the allied problem of the Government’s role.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—May I ask him to point out any particular clause where administration of the fund by the Syndicate is envisaged, that they can spend or that they can approve the expenditure. Because, I have not been able to find out that particular clause which empowers the Syndicate to spend the fund that is created.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I would request my friend to look at section 34 of the Bill and particularly sub-clause (2). That says :

“The University Fund shall be managed according to the provisions laid down in that behalf in the Statutes.”

Statutes have been defined in this Bill and which is the competent authority to frame and adumbrate statutes is also

known and in the first part of section 34, all the funds that go into the University Fund including what come under section 38 as grants of a non-lapsable nature from the Government —they are all put. Private donations, private income made by the University, grants from the Government, several other sources—from all these sources funds flow in and they go into the corpus of the Fund called the University Fund. The Fund is administered according to the provisions laid down in the Statutes.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I want to know whether they have the power to spend it.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Please see section 20—clause (f) on page 13.

“(i) to administer all properties and funds placed at the disposal of the University for specific purposes : and

(ii) to cause to be maintained proper accounts relating to the funds of the University.”

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Now, my own feeling is this. My friend seems to entertain a serious doubt: whether the Syndicate as such is asked and empowered to administer. If we look at the Act, so far as the University is concerned, if we take clause 20 (f) along with clause 34, Part II, the matter is very clear that all funds of the University shall go into that “Fund” and its administration shall be in accordance with the statute. If you look at the several provisions of the Bill, who are the competent authorities to make statutes as contra-distinct from ordinances and others? The authority for the other is the Syndicate. Therefore a statutory body will create these statutes.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—On a point of information. Ordinances are made by the Syndicate. Statutes are made by the Senate. Till now the practice was that the ordinances and the statutes must have the approval of the Government. What will be the position hereafter? Statute, if it is passed by the Senate, is it enough, or

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)
should it go for the approval of the Government or the Chancellor?

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as these provisions are concerned, there is no such rule that the consent of the Government should be obtained.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—As I was suggesting to the House through you, Sir, let us look at this Bill in a particular sense. It is possible that in respect of some provisions we may genuinely feel that a change and modification may be necessary. Possibly, I think even the Hon'ble Minister for Education would not say that this is a Bill sacrosanct in all its provisions and not a comma or semicolon would he have it changed. That is not the attitude. After all here is the skeleton placed before us embodying certain principles and objects which are sought to be worked out as a result of this Bill.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I may just bring to the notice of the Minister that every statute passed by the Senate shall be submitted to the Chancellor who may give or withhold his assent thereto or refer it back to the Senate for consideration. What I mean to say is this: that the Senate has not got absolute powers to pass its own laws and whatever the laws passed by the Senate or the Council, must be approved by the Government and to that extent their powers are curtailed.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I will go back to my original proposition which I made before this House. What do we mean by real autonomy? At any rate, to my mind it is very clear that in the case of University autonomy there are certain matters in respect of which the University must be the supreme authority, namely, academic matters, ways in which faculties are to be dealt with, ways in which subjects are to be taught and the various courses of studies. In respect of all these matters the Government or any other body would be a foreign body in the sense that they should not have a voice and they should have nothing to do in the matter.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Even to-day there is that provision. The

University is a supreme body in all these matters which you have envisaged now. There is nothing strange in granting them again here.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I don't understand my good friend when he says that because it is in the present Act it should not be in the new Bill. This new Bill is a comprehensive measure. As a matter of fact, on this becoming law, the old statute is repealed. Therefore the fact that certain provisions are already in one Bill or in the present Act does not necessarily mean and should not mean that it should not find a place in the present Bill. On the passing of this Act, the Mysore University Act as it exists today will be repealed. Therefore what I am suggesting to the House is this. Certain provisions which find a place in all such Bills and in all University statutes should find a place here. Let us look at this from another point of view. Since freedom has been obtained, there has been several University Acts. Before the country, and the most recent is the Venkateswara University Act passed by the Andhra Legislature. Now one has to see what the trend of thought and discussion in regard to University matters has been, how it has been developing and what is the current position and what is the way in which it has been developing. In that plane if we once look at it we find that old tradition is not still stuck to, in all respects and there is a genuine attempt or real feeling to cut a new ground or make a new departure in some respects. My own feeling is that this Bill envisages far-reaching changes, some of them revolutionary, as my very good friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar was pointing out. My first suggestion is: Let us look at this Bill in that comprehensive form and if there are still changes which are necessarily to be there, nobody would cry them back, nobody would cry a halt to them. That is the broad view that I would like to take so far as this Bill is concerned.

There are two other circumstances which have come up in the course of the discussion of the Bill in respect of which I would like to offer some remarks. One is the important

question of the Vice-Chancellor. My personal feeling is that election in the University atmosphere is never good. It is never good to the University; it is never good for the future of the country. In fact, when I was just looking around the hall here, I saw the bearded portrait of an ex-Vice-Chancellor, a distinguished Vice-Chancellor, a savant who served Mysore University in those days, namely, Dr. Brijendra Nath Seal. I ask, if we introduce an election element there, can we ever hope to get a savant like that, a distinguished person like that. Taking into consideration the political conditions that are now prevailing, taking the constitutional set up in which we are working, one can see that these political conditions will take some more time to settle down and become normal. So, considering all these uncertain conditions through which we are passing, under the present constitutional set up of our country, the introduction of election into the atmosphere of a University, I personally feel, could not be very happy. I therefore feel that there is a wise move when they say that the Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor and he shall be a man of letters, of scholarship, of eminent learning and culture, who commands respect from all concerned, possesses personal dignity and who will not only add to the dignity of the University but also add to the dignity of the entire country. He will be altogether an academic head. That is the view I think in which this particular provision has been conceived in this Bill.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—What has Madras done? Is there not an elected person of that eminence, scholarship and dignity and all those qualities which you have envisaged just now? Are there not several other universities which have been electing their own Vice-Chancellors? If they are electing some one to their credit, how are we inferior to them? Can we not select our own eminent men? Has not Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar been elected?

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Let a man like Sri Bheemappa Naik become

the Vice-Chancellor. He is so great that I do not want to risk him in an election. In an election Sri Bheemappa Naik stands very little chance. I want that his position should be made secure and that is what this Bill seeks to do. My Hon'ble friend Sri Bheemappa Naik was giving the analogy of Madras. Let us look at the history of Madras University. There was a time when they also felt that the elective procedure was not very congenial. Therefore, they have introduced what was called panel system. The authority concerned will select three and submit those names to His Excellency the Chancellor, namely, the Governor of Madras. He will make a selection out of that. That clearly shows that you are trying to tinker with essential principle and you are not prepared to go the whole hog. On the one hand the principle of introducing elective element straight into the University is not acceptable. On the other hand, there is the urge which is prompted by political considerations around. In between, you feel you are nowhere. You want to drive a compromise and try to please this view and that view. So a panel, there. As we know, compromises are merely euphemisms for surrender. It will be surrendering our principle. We shall fight out our way straight here. I ask this House to remember the effect of elections. I do not want to develop this thesis much further. It is so obvious and so patent that it is almost taken for granted by everybody. Sri Narayanaswamy was referring to the report of Dr. C. R. Reddy on elective element. There you have got a beautiful chapter in Sri Reddy's memorandum. We are only seven years old as a free country; political conditions are yet to become normal; political and party considerations and partisan considerations are there; various other considerations come in and we have yet to attune ourselves to the new environment and until that attunement comes and until we actually settle down and that settlement obtains where these political and partisan considerations will not weigh, we cannot think of anything else.

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

Until such things come, shall I say, until that mentality is developed in the politicians of our country, it is certainly not safe to leave our University to the vagaries, fortunes or misfortunes of elections. Therefore, I positively feel that here is a welcome departure, a very wholesome measure where, taking the experience of elections in the country, taking the experience obtaining all round, we have said that the Vice-Chancellor's Office shall not be an elective office, but he shall be appointed by the Chancellor. Therefore, Sir, let us consider another thing. This Bill is not intended merely for one or two years to come, not even for a decade. We are going to place on firm and statutory foundation the University of Mysore. There was a time when the University of Mysore was the pride of the whole of India. I remember those days when I was a young boy, with what fanfare and with what hopes and expectations and with what great ejaculations and happy feelings all round this University was heralded. We have gained by experience. Sri Narayanaswamy has devoted more than half of his address to this House to the way in which certain things have happened in the University. After all, they are questions which will arise when we really work out these provisions. Now what we have got to see in a Bill of this kind, taking the provisions as a whole, is, does it give a framework before us, a legal statutory framework so that vagaries may be minimised, and the real purpose of University may be carried out. Therefore, I personally feel that there is a big move made in some of the provisions; the Government say that they do not want to exercise certain powers and by putting restraint upon themselves they want to give great power to the University. That is a very good beginning. There is another question which has also to be considered. Taking the parliamentary form of Government that we have, can a Ministry divest itself of accountability to the Legislature when public funds are involved, is a very

fundamental question. I personally feel that however much a Minister might feel that way, so long as public funds from the State coffers are spent for a particular purpose like that, the Ministry's accountability can never be excused. That is inevitable. So far as the accountability of the Minister is concerned, there must be someone in this House who must be in a position to answer questions and to make himself responsible for it. That kind of nexus between the University to which public funds are given and the Government and the budgetary authority which really grants that can only be the Minister. Therefore, my feeling is that so long as this principle of accountability of a responsible Minister to the Legislature has got to be secured and safeguarded, it must necessarily and inevitably mean that the Government must have some over-riding voice. There are two suggestions made. One is made by my esteemed friend Sri Bheemappa Naik. In fact, he seems to feel that the use of the word 'Rajpramukh' as the Chancellor of the University of Mysore, if I may use a word with your very kind and generous permission, has a catch in it.

4-30 P.M.

I personally feel that no such idea is to be inferred. I request the Hon'ble Minister for Education to make the position clear that the use of the word Rajpramukh in that clause, the appointment of the Rajpramukh for the time being as the Chancellor of the University, has absolutely no other catch, no other strings behind it. It is an unalloyed and an unmistakable clear statement, namely, we want to have a *persona designata* as the Chancellor of the University and the *persona designata* we can think of in the present constitutional set-up is the Rajpramukh of the State. He said that this was a clever way of going to him through the Government. I am sure there is no such idea and if there is, I would be one with Sri Bheemappa Naik in opposing that view. In fact, I request the Hon'ble Minister for Education to make it clear in his reply

what is meant by that word. In fact, I personally feel that the Fazl Ali Commission Report that has come to us at the dawn of today. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—With all due respect to the opinion of the Hon'ble Member, we cannot ascribe a meaning which is not intended in the Constitution. The Rajpramukh has been inserted in the Constitution. The functions of the Rajpramukh are limited and circumscribed in the Constitution. Therefore, by giving a different meaning here, can we take away that power?

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—If the view was that by the use of the word Rajpramukh anything else is meant, I am whole-heartedly opposed to that view, and I am one with Sri Bheemappa Naik. But I personally feel it is not so. It ought not to be so and perhaps, it is not so. Therefore my position is very clear. by the use of the word Rajpramukh. . . .

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I would like you to know that Constitution has interpreted that word in a definite way and it cannot be anything other than that. If that is so, let us use some other word.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I was making a reference to the Fazl Ali Commission Report. According to that Report, the 'B' States have to be abolished. The institution of the Rajpramukhs has to go. Possibly the word 'Governor' will be uniform throughout all the States. In fact, I would make this suggestion to the Joint Select Committee that they should suitably amend, if necessary, the language of that section, so that no ambiguity could be possible and no doubt could be expressed. That is the view that is sought here in the reply of the Hon'ble Minister for Education. If that is the idea, I think it will be the unanimous opinion of this House that there should be no such change and the word should be very clear that by the word 'Rajpramukh' we merely mean a *persona designata* as the Chancellor. For instance, in the case of the Madras, Andhra and other Universities you may remember that only recently at the last

session of the Andhra Assembly, this particular provision was changed in the Venkateswara University Act. Formerly, it was the Chief Justice of the High Court who was the Chancellor. They changed it over and said that the Governor shall be the Chancellor. Similarly, I think we are all clear in our minds.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—How does the use of the word Governor change the meaning?

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—What I was suggesting to the House is this. Our mind is very clear. If this is not implied in the provision today, if it fell short of our hopes, if it fell short of our ideas, it should be our duty to see that the Joint Select Committee is properly instructed to make the necessary amendment. This was what I was suggesting. Fundamentally between me and Sri Bheemappa Naik, so far as the main idea is concerned, there is absolutely no difference. What I was suggesting was that we never meant by the use of the word Rajpramukh anything else than or more than what is obtaining in the other Universities throughout India. That is all I think. The matter may be left there.

I do not propose to go into the details as it is going to the Joint Select Committee. There are certain welcome changes in this Bill. But, as I stated earlier, certain amendments may become necessary. But that apart, essentially here is a sincere attempt made to put the University on a statutory basis. There are certain welcome features which I am sure will be appreciated all round. With these remarks, I personally feel that this Bill must be enthusiastically welcomed by the House and committed to the Joint Select Committee for such changes and amendments which must be made in the light of the discussion and debate. Virtually this Bill deserves the approbation of the entire House and I congratulate the Hon'ble Minister for Education in bringing forward a Bill of this kind. After all, throughout these three years, very many times, the question of the future of the Mysore University, giving it a statutory garb and placing it on a statutory basis

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

and endowing it with greater and greater powers, such as to grant University autonomy, academic autonomy, which is really the function of the University, have always come up on the floor of the House. Though it is three years, a serious attempt has now been made, and I congratulate the Hon'ble Minister for Education for having brought this Bill, and I whole-heartedly welcome it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮನೂಬಿಲ್ಡ್ ಈಗ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತಲೇ ಇದೆ. . . .

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲ್ಲ; ಹೊರದ ಸಾರಿ ಇದು ಮುಂದಿನಲ್ಲ ಬಿಡು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಯಂ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಸ್ವಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾದುದು. ಈಗ ಇದರ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಪ್ರಚಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಜ್ಞಾನ ಪ್ರಚಾರಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿ ಅಂಶದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡುವುದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯ. ಇವನ್ನು ಈಗ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸ್ವಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಪ್ರಜೆಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿದರು: ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 20ರಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಹಾಗೆಯೇ, ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿನೃತ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ದುಡ್ಡು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ದುಡ್ಡು ಸಾಲುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಾದವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶೇಕಡ 20 ರಷ್ಟು ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಿಗೆ ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ಕೊಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಈಗಿರುವ ಶೇಕಡ 80 ಅನಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರನ್ನು ಅಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಹಣವೆನೋ ದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಅಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಪಾಶಸ್ತ್ರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿನೃತ್ಯದ ವೆಚ್ಚ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರರಷ್ಟಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಶೇಕಡ 20 ರಷ್ಟು ಜನರನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅನಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರಾಗಿರುವ ಶೇಕಡ 80 ಮಂದಿಯನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದರ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದು ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿದೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡುವುದು. ನೌಕರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನೇಮಕ

ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ಜನರನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಇಲಾಖೆಯಾಗಿಯೇ ಅನೇಕ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳು ಅವರಿಂದ ಕೈತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಾಣಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ತಮ್ಮ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಗಳೇ ಬೇರೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ತಮ್ಮಗೇ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದವರೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಕೇಳಬೇಕು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವರಿಗೂ ನಮಾನಾವಕಾಶ ದೊರಕಿಸುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿರುವಾಗ, ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವರಿಂದ ಹೊರಗಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿತ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಕೂಡದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನರು ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಹೊಂದಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ವಿಜ್ಞಾನಮೂಲಕ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೊಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೊಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿ, ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನರು ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಿಕ್ಕದವರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದೇ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಒಮ್ಮೆ interview ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಅವನಿಗೆ ಒಂದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದರಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸಾರಿ ಇಂಟರ್‌ವ್ಯೂ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗಲೇ ಯಾರು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಅರ್ಹತೆಯೆಂಬುದು ಮನದಟ್ಟಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪದವಿಧರರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೂ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರಿಗೇ ವಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಯಾ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಶಾಖೆಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಭವವಿರುವವರು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಂಥದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆಯಾ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಇಲಾಖಾ ಮೊಖೇಸರವರು ಇನ್ನೂ ಯಾರಾರೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅನುಭವ ಪಡೆದವರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಮಾತ್ರ ಈಗಿರುವ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನ ಮೂಲಕವೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

ಅಮೇಲೆ, ಈಚೀಚೆಗೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದವರು ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದೊಂದು ಶುಭ ಸೂಚನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿನೃತ್ಯ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವವರಿಗೂ ಈಗ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿನೃತ್ಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರಕಿದಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತಾಗಲಿದೆಯೋ ಅದಿಲ್ಲವೂ ಅದರ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ (ನಾಗರ-ಹೊಸ ನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮನೂಬಿಲ್ಡ್ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ

ನಾನು ಕೆಲವು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಮನೋವೈಯಲಿಂಗತತ್ವ ಕೆಲವು ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಗಳಾದ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ನಾಯಕರು, ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರವರ ಮತ್ತು ನಾರಾಯಣ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು ಈ ಹೊಸ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದು ಸಾಧಕವಾಗಲಾರದು ಎಂಬ ಅನುಮಾನವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರು. ಅಂಥ ಶಂಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಾರಣವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಆಗಲೇ ಶ್ರೀ ಪಟ್ಟಾಭಿರಾಮೇಶ್ವರರು ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ನಾನು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದನ್ನೂ ವಿಮರ್ಶಿಸಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಮನೋವೈಯಲಿಂಗತತ್ವ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸುಧಾರಿಸಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ; ಮೇಲಾಗಿ, ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ತನ್ನ ಆದಳಿತವನ್ನು ಸುಗಮವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯಾಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದಳಿತ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಾಗಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದಿದೆ.

ಆದರೆ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಆದರ್ಶವನ್ನು ಈ ಮನೋವೈಯಲಿಂಗತತ್ವದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ವಿವರಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬ ಶಂಕೆ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿದೆ. ಸುಮಾರು 20 ಸಾವಿರ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷವೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ವ್ಯಾಸಂಗವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸಿ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈಗ ಒಂದು ನಿಯಮವನ್ನು (b) ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಮುಗಿಸಿದ ಹೊರತು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕೇಟ್ ದೊರೆಯಲಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸುಮಾರು 12 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ 12 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಕೂಡ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮುಗಿಸಿ ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವೆಯ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದೇ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಜೊತೆಗೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಅವರ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿಗಳ ಇಂದಿನ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೊಂದು ಫೀಜು ಅಥವಾ ಅಲೋಯನ್ಸ್ ಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯದ ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಎಂಬುದೂ ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ನಾಯಕ್.—ಈ 12 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಂದ ಅಲೋಯನ್ಸ್‌ನಾಗಲಿ ಮತ್ತೇನೆನ್ನಾಗಲಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದೆಯಲ್ಲಾ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಈ 12 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಖರ್ಚು ವೆಚ್ಚಗಳನ್ನೂ ತೂಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅನಂತರ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಭತ್ಯೆದ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಏನೇ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿದರೂ ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದ ಮಾತು. ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡುವವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವೈಕಪೆಂಡ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಈಗ ತಾವು ಒದಗಿಸಿರುವ

ಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದರಷ್ಟಾದರೂ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ನಾವು ನೋಡಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ವ್ಯಾಸಂಗ ಮುಗಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಕೋಲಿಯಾ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ, ಚಾಮರಾಜೇಂದ್ರ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ, ಮುಂತಾದವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೌಸ್ ಸರ್ಜನ್ ಆಗಿ ತರಬೇತು ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ನಿಯಮವಿದೆ.

ನಾನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅವರಲ್ಲರೂ ಆ ವಿಕೋಲಿಯಾ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಡಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಕಾಲ ಕಳೆದು ಈಚೆಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಬ್ಬ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಸೀನಿಯರ್ ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಅಥವಾ ಸರ್ಜನ್ ಇದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು, ನಿವೃತ್ತ ಇಂಥಿಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ಟೈಪಿನಿಂಗ್ ಪಡೆಯಿರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಏರ್ಪಾಡನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ತಿರುಗಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನೌಕರಿಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ಷಾಪನ್ನೋ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವ ತನಕ ಅಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಅನಂತರ ಈಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದುಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನೂ ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅವರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯದಿಂದ ಈ ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ತತ್ವ ಸರಿಯೆಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಎಲ್ಲೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಿವೃತ್ತ ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇವಲ ಕಾಗದದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಸ್ವತಃ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆ. ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರ ಬೆನ್ನು ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ತಾವು ಯಾರನ್ನಾದರೂ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಿ ; ಆಗ ಆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಮಗೇ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಕಾರಣಗಳೂ ಇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದೊಂದು ಹೊಸ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಇದೊಂದು ಆದರ್ಶಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿ ರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದರೂ ಇದು ಸಾರ್ಥಕವಾಗದ ಮಾತು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡುವುದು ಉಚಿತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳ ಆದಳಿತವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಇವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಒಳಾಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿರತವೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾರದೂ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿರಲಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರುಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಾವು ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಾಫೀಸಿನ ಗುಮಾಸ್ತರನ್ನು ಕಾಣುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಗುಮಾಸ್ತನಿಗೆ ಇರುವಷ್ಟು ಕೂಡ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆಯೂ ಹಾಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿತ್ತು, ಇಂದೂ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಈ ಬೋಧಕರನ್ನು ಬಂದಿಲೇಖನಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಈಗಲೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಾದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ನಮಗೆ ಯಾವ ಏಥದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕ್ಷೇಮವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಬೆನಾರಸ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ, ಉಸ್ತಾನಿಯಾ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ, ಮತ್ತು ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಅಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಆ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರಿಗೆ—ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.)

ವಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೇನೂ ಗಂಡಾಂತರವಾಗರಾರದು. ಈ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಫಲ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ದೊರೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕೋ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅದು ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ನಾವು ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬೆಳೆಸಬಹುದೋ ಅಷ್ಟರವರೆಗೂ ಬೆಳೆಸಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ದೃಢತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಂತಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತಮಗೊಂಡರೆ ನಾವು ಅಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೂ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯಬಹುದು. ಈ ವಿಶ್ವ ವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳು ನಿತ್ಯಜೀವನಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹುಡುಗರನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸುವಂತೆ ಆಗಕೂಡದು. ಈ ಆದಳತದಲ್ಲಿ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತನ್ನ ಕೈವಾಡವನ್ನು ಅದಷ್ಟೂ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಮ್ಮಿಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಿಜವಾದ ಸ್ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಿಂದ, ಉತ್ಸಾಹದಿಂದ ಪಾಠ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಮಾಯವಾಗಿ ಹೋಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಇಂದಿನ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ವಂತರ ವಿದ್ಯೆಯ ಮಟ್ಟ ಕೂಡ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗು ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ದೃಶ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಬಿ.ಎ. ಮತ್ತು ಎಂ.ಎ. ಪದವಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದರೆ ಇಂತಿಷ್ಟು ದರ್ಜೆಯ ಕೆಲಸ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬಾರದು. ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಗೌರವ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತಾಗಬೇಕು. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಎಲ್ಲ ರಲ್ಲೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಜೀವನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರಕ ಲಿಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಕಡುನಿರಾಸೆ ಕವಿದಿದೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಭಾವನೆಯು ತೊಲಗಿ ಜ್ಞಾನಾರ್ಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರ ತಕ್ಕವರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಅನಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರನ್ನು ಅಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಓಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅನೇಕರು ಅನಿವಾರ್ಯದಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮ ಜೀವನೋಪಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಗೂ ಹೀಗೂ ಮಾಡಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದಲೇ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ

ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಾವು ಮುಂದುವರಿದರೆ ಸಾಕೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಅವರಿಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ದಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬಂದವರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಹೀಗಿರಬಾರದು. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸಂಪತ್ತು ಇರತಕ್ಕವರು ಅವರ ಸಂಪ ತ್ತನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲದವರಿಗೆ ದಾನಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರು ವಿದ್ಯೆ ಇಲ್ಲದವರಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿದ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ದಾನಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾ ನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಪ್ತೇನೂ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ನೋಡತಕ್ಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಕೋಣ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಕೋಣ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗದ ಹೊರತು ನಮಗೆ ಸ್ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ನೈತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡುವ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಕೂಡಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to know whether the Hon'ble Member intends to close his speech or take some time more.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—I want to say one or two important things.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet again at 12 O'clock to-morrow.

The House adjourned for the day at Five of the Clock to meet again at Twelve of the Clock on Tuesday, the 11th October 1955.